

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
2 Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151)
3 charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com
4 David A. Perlson (Bar No. 209502)
5 davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com
6 Melissa J. Baily (Bar No. 237649)
7 melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com
8 John Neukom (Bar No. 275887)
9 johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com
10 Jordan Jaffe (Bar No. 254886)
11 jordanjaffe@quinnemanuel.com
12 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
13 San Francisco, California 94111-4788
14 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
15 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

16 Attorneys for Waymo LLC

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
19 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

20 WAYMO LLC,

21 Plaintiff,
22 vs.

23 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;
24 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING
25 LLC,

26 Defendants.

27 CASE NO. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

28 **PLAINTIFF WAYMO'S REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO
COMPEL UBER SOURCE CODE**

1 In just the few days since Waymo filed its motion to compel, yet more information has come
 2 to light regarding Uber's misappropriation of Waymo's proprietary software. Yesterday, Friday,
 3 October 13, Waymo took the continued deposition of Don Burnette, a former Waymo employee and
 4 current technical lead for software autonomy at Uber. (Ex. 1 (Burnette 10/13 Tr.) at 8:17-20.)
 5 Because Mr. Burnette was a "Diligenced Employee," Waymo reserved four hours of his deposition
 6 time to continue his deposition after production of the Stroz Report and related materials.

7 At the deposition, it became clear that Mr. Burnette's initial deposition testimony was not
 8 accurate and left out key—if not the most relevant—facts concerning the provenance of Uber's
 9 motion planner software that is the subject of Waymo's motion to compel. When confronted with
 10 materials uncovered as a result of the production of the Stroz report and related materials, including
 11 handwritten notes, a document from his personal Gmail account and source code files on the forensic
 12 image of his Otto computer, Mr. Burnette was forced to admit new facts that support Waymo's new
 13 allegations of software misappropriation and the need for production of Uber's current code:

14 • Burnette originally testified that Otto arrived at its motion planner differently: [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 (Ex. 2 at 53:20-23.) Yesterday, Mr. Burnette was confronted with handwritten notes found on
 18 his laptop and stored at Stroz. (Ex. 3 (Burnette Notes).) The notes were dated **February 10**.
 19 (*Id.*) Burnette's last day at Waymo was **February 9**. (Ex. 1 at 75:9-10.) Far from going to the
 20 drawing board, Burnette admitted he [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED] (*Id.* at 201:6-202:1.) Contrary to his prior testimony that [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED] (*Id.* at 76:16-20; Ex. 2 at 53:9-54:5.) These notes
 26 detail [REDACTED] Otto created and Uber now uses for its motion
 27 planner. (Ex. 3.) Burnette confirmed that he worked on the same techniques for Waymo in
 28 2015. (Ex. 1. at 77:17-78:10.)

23 Uber argues that Waymo is on a “fishing expedition” and seeks a “do-over.” To the contrary,
24 Waymo already has discovered willful misappropriation of multiple hardware trade secrets, and
25 Waymo is diligently tracking down Uber’s recently discovered theft of its autonomous vehicle
26 software. Uber hid enormous amounts of data behind the Stroz Report beyond the discovery
27 deadline. Uber hid the fact that it copied a critical portion of Waymo’s software, in clear violation
28 of multiple court orders. And Uber’s former Waymo employee, Mr. Burnette, who is now the

1 technology head of software autonomy at Uber, lied about it before being forced, reluctantly to
 2 admit it after getting caught based on information from the Stroz production.

3 Uber now continues to obfuscate, apparently (improperly) arguing “futility” by speculating
 4 that certain snippets of Waymo’s source code were publicly disclosed, which is belied by the
 5 prominent “Google[x] Confidential” stamps on the very documents Uber cites, and at any rate,
 6 obviously fails to address the clearly proprietary source code files and evidence that Mr. Burnette
 7 lied about. Uber’s attempt to throw down yet another blocking move, citing Section 2019.230.
 8 (Dkt. 1990-10 at 2), also cannot be accepted. This 11th hour request to force Waymo to stop
 9 discovery ignores the October 23 deadline set by the District Court for Waymo to simultaneously
 10 complete discovery, submit revised expert reports and move for leave to amend its trade secret list.
 11 Given the District Court’s prospective denial of a further continuance, granting Uber’s request will
 12 bar Waymo from confirming Mr. Burnette’s admission that [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED] (Compare
 16 Ex. 1 at 29:12-22 *with* Ex. 3 at 2.)

17 Mr. Burnette’s testimony is the exact type of evidence that Waymo suspected the Stroz
 18 Report might uncover and a reason why Waymo stated as part of its motion for continuance: “Now,
 19 suppose we look at those and we can tie those back into the software they provided so there’s
 20 absolutely no question that he took some software and copied it and put it in. We might bring that
 21 up to the Court and we might say we want to add that claim.” (Dkt. 1723, Sept. 20 Hr’g Tr. at 77:7-
 22 18.) In granting Waymo’s motion, the Court recognized that Waymo may want to amend its list of
 23 asserted trade secrets in light of the Stroz materials, setting a deadline of October 23. (Dkt. 1954;
 24 Oct. 3 Tr. at 42:5-19.) Review and production of Uber’s current source code is precisely the type
 25 of new discovery warranted by the recently uncovered evidence of software related trade secret
 26 misappropriation. Waymo asks the Court to order Uber to produce its current code to confirm Mr.
 27 Burnette’s testimony.

1 DATED: October 14, 2017

2 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN,
3 LLP

4 By /s/ Charles K. Verhoeven

5 Charles K. Verhoeven
6 Attorneys for WAYMO LLC

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28